

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace sheets 1, 2, 14 and 16 with the corresponding replacement sheets herein provided.

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 29, 2005. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 7-15.

Submitted herewith are replacement sheets for FIGS 1, 2, 12 and 14. FIG. 1 has been amended to include reference number 30. FIG. 2 has been amended to correct reference number for keypad 84. FIG. 12 has been amended to include reference number 301. FIG. 14 has been amended to include reference number 305. Each of these reference numbers are provided in the specification.

The Office Action first reports that claims 1, 2, 7 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) has been anticipated by Dragosh et al. (US 6366886). Referring first to claim 1, the Office Action reports that this reference teaches the invention of claim 1, citing col. 4, line 30 to col. 5, line 67 and col. 6, lines 54 - 67. With this amendment, applicant has amended claimed 1 to include the steps of "receiving from the remote location data indicative of a prompt for the user to be used when the recognition results are indicative of no recognition of the input from the client; converting the data indicative of the prompt to speech data when the recognition results are indicative of no recognition of the input from the client; and sending the speech data to the client device over the wide area network." Upon review of Dragosh et al., nowhere does this reference teach or suggest the invention now recited by claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection respectfully request.

Independent claim 11 has been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1. For the reasons provided above, applicant respectfully believes that claim 1 is also allowable.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Dragosh et al. in view of Ladd et al. (US 6269336). Claims 14 and 15 now canceled recited the step of "providing a prompt the remote location" and "wherein providing a prompt comprises converting text data to speech data and providing the speech data to the remote location", respectively. It was reported in paragraph 12 of the Office Action that Dragosh et al. fail to specifically disclose the step of providing a prompt to the remote location but that Ladd et al. teach the elements recited in claims 14 and 15 at col. 14, lines 43-67 and col. 14, lines 10-14.

It is believed that Ladd et al. disclose in the most relevant embodiment illustrated in FIG. 3 a system 200 that allows users of communication devices indicated at 201, 202, 203 and 204 to access information stored on content providers 208 and 209 using a communication node 212 (col. 5, ll. 12-38). It is believed a summary of some aspects of the system 200 is provided at col. 11, ll. 25-63, wherein response to voice inputs from the user or DTMF tones, presumably using one of the connection devices 201-204, the voice browser 250 can navigate to a designation or content provider 208, 209. After the voice browser 250 is connected to an information source, the information source provides information that can include text content, mark-up language documents or pages, non-text content, dialogs, audio sample data, recognition grammars, etc.

Based on the information collected, the voice browser 250 allows interactive voice applications. FIGS. 5A-5C illustrate a flow diagram for providing an interactive voice application. This procedure is discussed at col. 13, ll. 66-col. 15, ll. 59. Voice browser 250 accesses and uses a voice response unit server 234 having a text-to-speech converter 252 and a speech recognizer 254. One of the steps of voice browser 250 must undertake in order to perform a speech recognition is to determine whether a

pre-determined grammar exists for the user input which is described at col. 14, ll. 18-42. Since the voice browser 250 is used to allow information to be received from the content provider 208/209, it is believed that the grammars appropriate for obtaining the information is closely associated with the content providers 208, 209 or contained in the markup pages from mark-up language servers 251, 257. Once the grammar has been established, the voice browser can then match the user input to the grammar in order to provide an interactive voice application (col. 14, ll. 41-42).

The inventions recited by the independent claims of the present application are patentably different from the system taught and suggested by Ladd et al. FIG. 5 of the present application illustrates an architecture 200 for web based recognition. As best summarized at p. 14, ll. 15-29, the architecture includes a client device 30, a web server 202 and a recognition speech server 204. When recognition is desired such as voice recognition on the client device for an application provided by the web server 202, the client device 30 may not be capable or powerful enough to perform voice recognition and as such can offload this task to the speech server 204. In particular, the client device 30 provides data indicative of the audio signals from the user as well as an indication of a grammar or language model to be used during speech recognition by the speech server 204. In other words, the speech server receives data indicative of what the user has spoken as well as a grammar to perform recognition. The speech server 204 performs recognition and returns the results back to the client device 30 for local rendering if desired or appropriate.

As discussed further on page 15, ll. 7-13, using the architecture described, authoring at the web server 202 can be focused on the application to which it is intended without the

authors needing to know the intricacies of the speech server 204. Instead, the speech server 204 can be independently designed and connected to the network 205 and be updated and approved without further changes required at the web server 202. With the features now recited in the independent claims, a tailored prompt can be provided in cases of non-recognition since this is under the control of the application author at the web server. This is not believed taught by the combination of Dragosh et al. in view of Ladd et al.

Applicant hereby requests an extension of time to respond to the Final Office Action. A charge authorization for the extension of time fee is enclosed.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188  
Suite 1400 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:dkm